REMARKS

Claims 1, 4-23, 25, and 26 are pending in the present application. In the Final Office Action mailed July 9, 2010, the Examiner rejected claims 1, 4-7, 10, 15, 23, 25, and 26 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manduley (USP 5,956,505) in view of Tajima et al. (6,402,737). The Examiner next rejected claims 8, 9, 11-14, and 16-22 under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manduley in view of Tajima et al., and further in view of Admitted Prior Art.

In the Final Office Action dated July 9, 2010, the Examiner maintained the outstanding rejections. Responsive thereto, the undersigned called the Examiner on September 1, 2010, to discuss the rejections. In the telephone conference, the undersigned and the Examiner discussed possible amendments to the independent claims that could be made to place the claims in condition for allowance.

In furtherance of the telephone conversation conducted with the Examiner, Applicant has elected to file a Request for Continued Examination concurrently with the present response. In the Request for Continued Examination, Applicant has amended claims 1, 10, 18, and 23, and has newly added claims 27 and 28. Support for the new and amended claims can be found in the Specification at page 9, lines 17-21; page 12, lines 13-22; and page 14, lines 12-22. As amended, Applicant believes that the claims define over the art of record.

Claim 1

As amended, claim 1 calls for, in part, a method to remotely enable software-enabled options that includes receiving an option-enabling request from the user at the centralized facility specifying an option requested to be enabled in equipment at a subscribing station, generating an enabling feature at the centralized facility upon confirmation that the option has not already been enabled, sending the enabling feature from the centralized facility to the equipment in the subscribing station, and activating the option in the equipment, with the option-enabling request received at the centralized facility being transmitted from a workstation via a remote link and with the workstation being a separate device from each of the subscribing station and the centralized facility and being at a location remote from each of the subscribing station and the centralized facility.

Claim 1 was previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manduley in view of Tajima et al. However, the combination of cited references fails to teach or suggest that which is now called for in claim 1. That is, the combination of Manduley and Tajima et al. fails to teach or suggest that an option-enabling request for a subscribing station that is

received at the centralized facility is transmitted from a workstation that is separate from each of the subscribing station and the centralized facility via a remote link, with the workstation also being at a location remote from each of the subscribing station and the centralized facility.

Instead, with respect to Manduley, a device 20 is set forth that includes inactive programs or features thereon that are requested to be activated. *See Manduley*, Columns 5-7. Requests are transmitted from the device 20 to a remote data center to request codes therefrom and receive activation codes upon confirmation of a verified user/device making the request. *Manduley*, Col. 5, lns. 7-11 and Col. 6, lns. 45-50. A process by which the data center processes a request from device 20 begins with receipt of the request at the data center. The data center decrypts the received request code in order to determine what programs or features are requested to be activated. *Manduley*, Col. 7, lns. 61-63. Upon decryption, the data center updates the customer's file to reflect activation of the requested programs or features and generates a code that, when entered into device 20, will cause device 20 to update its activation map to activate the requested application or features. After the activation code is generated, it is encrypted. *Manduley*, Col. 8, lns. 17-37. The code is then transmitted via a data communication link back to device 20, where it is entered either manually or automatically to update the activation map of program activation module 58, thereby activating the requested application program(s). *Id.*

Thus, with respect to a request to enable an inactive feature, such requests are made via the device 20. The request can be made "by entry of appropriate data or selection of a menu item through keyboard 28 [of device 20]," *Manduley*, Col. 5, lns. 8-10, with a program activation module 58 of device 20 "generat[ing] an integrated request code... [and] the software activation request." *Manduley*, Col. 6, lns. 46-48. Manduley, however, does not teach or suggest that the option-enabling request for device 20 can be made from a workstation that is separate therefrom and via a remote link, with such a workstation being a separate device from the device 20 and a centralized facility and being at a location remote therefrom.

Similarly, Tajima et al. also fails to teach or suggest generation of an option-enabling request from such a workstation.

Therefore, in light of at least the above, claim 1 is believed to be patentably distinct from the cited references.

Claim 10

As amended, claim 10 calls for, in part, an option-enabling system that includes a subscribing station having a central server, a plurality of in-field products networked to the central server, and a computer separate from the central server and the plurality of in-field

products that is programmed to control a transfer of data to and from the plurality of in-field products so as to function as a centralized management system there for. Also included in the option-enabling system are an on-line center capable of receiving and authenticating a user I.D., validating an option request for at least one of the plurality of in-field products, and creating an option key in response thereto, with the computer at the subscribing station transmitting each of the user I.D. and the option request for a specified in-field product to the on-line center by way of the central server and the communications network.

Claim 10 was previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manduley in view of Tajima et al. However, the combination of cited references fails to teach or suggest that which is now called for in claim 10. That is, the combination of Manduley and Tajima et al. fails to teach or suggest a computer at a subscribing station that is separate from a central server and a plurality of in-field products and that is programmed to control a transfer of data to and from the plurality of in-field products so as to function as a centralized management system there for, with the computer at the subscribing station transmitting each of a user I.D. and an option request for a specified in-field product to the on-line center by way of the central server and the communications network.

As set forth above with respect to claim 1, Manduley, a device 20 is set forth that includes inactive programs or features thereon that are requested to be activated. *See Manduley*, Columns 5-7. Requests are transmitted from the device 20 to a remote data center to request codes therefrom and receive activation codes upon confirmation of a verified user/device making the request. *Manduley*, Col. 5, lns. 7-11 and Col. 6, lns. 45-50. A process by which the data center processes a request from device 20 begins with receipt of the request at the data center. The data center decrypts the received request code in order to determine what programs or features are requested to be activated. *Manduley*, Col. 7, lns. 61-63. Upon decryption, the data center updates the customer's file to reflect activation of the requested programs or features and generates a code that, when entered into device 20, will cause device 20 to update its activation map to activate the requested application or features. After the activation code is generated, it is encrypted. *Manduley*, Col. 8, lns. 17-37. The code is then transmitted via a data communication link back to device 20, where it is entered either manually or automatically to update the activation map of program activation module 58, thereby activating the requested application program(s). *Id.*

Manduley, however, does not teach or suggest a computer separate from the device 20 that transmits each of a user I.D. and an option request to the remote data center. Instead, with

respect to transmitting a request to enable an inactive feature, such requests are made via the device 20. The request can be made "by entry of appropriate data or selection of a menu item through keyboard 28 [of device 20]," *Manduley*, Col. 5, lns. 8-10, with a program activation module 58 of device 20 "generat[ing] an integrated request code... [and] the software activation request." *Manduley*, Col. 6, lns. 46-48. Thus, the device 20 itself generates and transmits the request, which is not what is called for in claim 10.

Similarly, Tajima et al. also fails to teach or suggest transmitting of a user I.D. and an option request to an on-line center to enable an option on a specified in-field product, with the user I.D. and option request being transmitted to the on-line center from a computer that is separate from the in-field product.

Therefore, in light of at least the above, claim 10 is believed to be patentably distinct from the cited references.

Claims 18 and 23

As amended, each of claims 18 and 23 call, in part, enabling an option in a device, where an option-enabling request is received from a user to request an option to be enabled in a device located remotely from an on-line center. An enabling feature/option key is generated at the on-line center responsive to the request and is transmitted to the device to enable the option, with the enabling feature/option key including therein software to be installed on the device.

Claims 18 and 23 were previously rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Manduley in view of Tajima et al. However, the combination of cited references fails to teach or suggest that which is now called for in claims 18 and 23. That is, the combination of Manduley and Tajima et al. fails to teach or suggest transmitting an enabling feature/option key from a remote on-line center to a device in response to an option-enabling request, with the enabling feature/option key including therein software to be installed on the device. Instead, Manduley discloses that, in response to a request from device 20 to enable an inactive option, the remote data center transmits to the device 20 activation codes to activate the inactive option. The entered code is decrypted by device 20 to update an activation map of the device and activate the optional feature. *Manduley*, Col. 6, ln. 64 to Col. 7, ln. 5 and Col. 7, lns. 24-28. Thus, Manduley discloses that the remote data center only transmits <u>activation codes</u> to the device 20, which is not what is called for in claims 18 and 23, as claims 18 and 23 each call for the transmission of <u>software to be installed</u> from the on-line center to the device.

Similarly, Tajima et al. also fails to teach or suggest transmitting of an enabling feature/option key from an on-line center to a device to enable an option, with the enabling feature/option key including therein software to be installed on the device.

Therefore, in light of at least the above, each of claims 18 and 23 are believed to be patentably distinct from the cited references.

<u>Claims 27 and 28</u>

Each of claims 27 and 28 call for transmitting of an enabling feature/option key from an on-line center to a device to enable an option, with the enabling feature/option key including therein software to be installed on the device. For the reasons set forth above with respect to claims 18 and 23, each of claims 27 and 28 is believed to be patentably distinct over the art of record.

In light of at least the foregoing, Applicant respectfully believes that the present application is in condition for allowance. As a result, Applicant respectfully requests timely issuance of a Notice of Allowance for claims 1, 4-23, and 25-28.

No fees are deemed necessary for the claims newly presented herein, as an equal (or greater) number of claims were previously canceled in the Response dated October 20, 2009.

Applicant appreciates the Examiner's consideration of these Amendments and Remarks and cordially invites the Examiner to call the undersigned, should the Examiner consider any matters unresolved.

Respectfully submitted,

/Kevin R. Rosin/

Kevin R. Rosin
Registration No. 55,584
Phone 262-268-8100 ext. 15
krr@zpspatents.com

Dated: October 11, 2010
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.023

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
136 South Wisconsin Street
Port Washington, WI 53074
262-268-8100

General Authorization and Extension of Time

The Commissioner is hereby authorized to charge any additional fees which may be required regarding this application under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16-1.17, or credit any overpayment, to Deposit Account No. 50-2402. Should no proper payment be enclosed herewith, as by credit card authorization being in the wrong amount, unsigned, post-dated, otherwise improper or informal or even entirely missing, the Commissioner is authorized to charge the unpaid amount to Deposit Account No. 50-2402. If any extensions of time are needed for timely acceptance of papers submitted herewith, Applicant hereby petitions for such extensions under 37 C.F.R. §1.136 and authorizes payment of any such extensions fees to Deposit Account No. 50-2402. Please consider this a general authorization to charge any fee that is due in this case, if not otherwise timely paid, to Deposit Account No. 50-2402.

/Kevin R. Rosin/

_____

Kevin R. Rosin
Registration No. 55,584
Phone 262-268-8100 ext. 15
krr@zpspatents.com

Dated: October 11, 2010
Attorney Docket No.: GEMS8081.023

P.O. ADDRESS:
Ziolkowski Patent Solutions Group, SC
136 South Wisconsin Street
Port Washington, WI 53074
262-268-8100